arXiv:1403.3621v1 [math.GM] 12 Mar 2014

Correctness of depiction in planar diagrams of spatial figures

P. L. Robinson

This study was motivated in part by the following question: is it possible to decide whether a given planar diagram correctly depicts a given spatial figure? We do not propose to address this question in full generality or even to define exactly what it means. Instead, we shall precisely formulate a special case for which we offer a complete answer. To be specific, we pose the following

Question: Let π be a plane in which $P_1Q_1R_1S_1$ and $P_2Q_2R_2S_2$ are quadrangles; assume that P_1P_2, Q_1Q_2, R_1R_2, S_1S_2 all pass through the point O. Is it possible to decide whether this diagram is a correct two-dimensional depiction of the three-dimensional figure comprising a quadrangle '$P_1Q_1R_1S_1$' in one plane along with its quadrangular shadow '$P_2Q_2R_2S_2$' in another plane as projected from a 'light source' at 'O'?

We shall show that it is indeed possible to make this decision, by checking a simple condition whose necessity and sufficiency follow from Theorems 1 and 2 respectively.

Naturally, we view this problem as belonging to the province of Projective Geometry; in particular, we accept that any two lines in the same plane have a point of intersection. We defer to the authority of Veblen and Young [2] for a classic treatment of the subject; Chapters I and II more than cover most of what we require. For a more recent account, see Coxeter [1].

It will be convenient to fix some notation, to be used throughout. Let $PQRS$ be a plane quadrangle, no three of whose vertices P, Q, R, S are collinear. Its diagonal triangle ABC has as vertices the points in which

its opposite sides intersect:

$$A = SP \cdot QR, \;\; B = SQ \cdot RP, \;\; C = SR \cdot PQ.$$

When the vertices P, Q, R, S are decorated with overlines or subscripts, the diagonal points A, B, C will be decorated correspondingly. Perspectivity has the customary meaning: for instance, when the lines A_1A_2, B_1B_2, C_1C_2 all pass through O we say that the triangles $A_1B_1C_1$ and $A_2B_2C_2$ are perspective from O and write

$$A_1B_1C_1 \overset{O}{\overline{\wedge}} A_2B_2C_2.$$

Theorem 1. *Let O be a point not on either of the distinct planes $\overline{\pi}$ and π. Let $\overline{PQRS}$ be a quadrangle in $\overline{\pi}$ and let $PQRS$ be a quadrangle in π. If $\overline{PQRS} \overset{O}{\overline{\wedge}} PQRS$ then $\overline{ABC} \overset{O}{\overline{\wedge}} ABC$.*

Proof. The lines $\overline{S}S$ and $\overline{Q}Q$ meet in O, so the points $O, S, \overline{S}, Q, \overline{Q}$ lie on a plane, which contains the point $\overline{B}$ of $\overline{SQ}$. Accordingly, the (coplanar) lines $O\overline{B}$ and SQ meet; similarly, $O\overline{B}$ and RP meet. Consequently, $O\overline{B}$ meets the plane π in the point

$$O\overline{B} \cdot \pi = SQ \cdot RP = B.$$

In like manner, $O\overline{C} \cdot \pi = C$ and $O\overline{A} \cdot \pi = A$. We preferred to focus on B since this diagonal point lies 'inside' the quadrangle $PQRS$ when it is drawn in the 'obvious' way. □

Thus, perspectivity of two *simple* quadrangles in different planes forces perspectivity of the *complete* quadrangles.

In terms of our original **Question**, the preceding theorem yields perspectivity from O of the diagonal triangles as a necessary condition for correctness of depiction. In order to establish that this condition is also sufficient, we must attend to obligatory special cases as usual; we prefer to frame this attention as a preparatory discussion, rather than as a formal theorem.

Thus, let π be a plane in which the quadrangles $P_1Q_1R_1S_1$ and $P_2Q_2R_2S_2$ are perspective from a point O. Suppose that the quadrangles are so placed that at least one side in each opposite pair equals its homologue under the perspectivity. There are two cases to consider: (Δ) three sides that equal

their homologues make up a triangle; (•) three sides that equal their homologues meet at a vertex.

Case (Δ): Say $Q_1R_1 = Q_2R_2$, $R_1P_1 = R_2P_2$, $P_1Q_1 = P_2Q_2$. In this case, $P_1 = P_2$, $Q_1 = Q_2$, $R_1 = R_2$: in fact, if $R_1 \neq R_2$ then as R_1 lies on Q_1R_1 and R_2 lies on Q_2R_2 it follows that $Q_1R_1 = Q_2R_2 = R_1R_2$ while $R_1R_2 = R_1P_1 = R_2P_2$ follows similarly; but now $R_1R_2 = P_1Q_1 = P_2Q_2$ violates non-collinearity of P_1, Q_1, R_1 and P_2, Q_2, R_2. Thus: the quadrangles have the form $PQRS_1$ and $PQRS_2$.

Case (•): Say $S_1P_1 = S_2P_2$, $S_1Q_1 = S_2Q_2$, $S_1R_1 = S_2R_2$. In this case, $S_1 = S_2$: in fact, if $S_1 \neq S_2$ then $S_1S_2 = S_1R_1 = S_2R_2$ and so on, whence S_1S_2 passes through the non-collinear points P_1, Q_1, R_1 and P_2, Q_2, R_2. The quadrangles now have the form $P_1Q_1R_1S$ and $P_2Q_2R_2S$. We claim that among the pairs $(P_1, P_2), (Q_1, Q_2), (R_1, R_2)$ at most one can have distinct entries: indeed, if $P_1 \neq P_2$ and $Q_1 \neq Q_2$ then $OS = P_1P_2 = Q_1Q_2$ in violation of non-collinearity. Thus: the quadrangles have the form PQR_1S and PQR_2S.

The conclusion to this preparatory discussion is that if at least one side in each opposite pair agrees with its homologue then at most one homologous pair of vertices is distinct.

Theorem 2. *In a plane π, let the quadrangles $P_1Q_1R_1S_1$ and $P_2Q_2R_2S_2$ be perspective from O. If their diagonal triangles $A_1B_1C_1$ and $A_2B_2C_2$ are also perspective from O then there exists a quadrangle $\overline{PQRS}$ in a plane $\overline{\pi} \neq \pi$ along with points $O_1 \neq O_2$ not in either plane, such that*

$$P_1Q_1R_1S_1 \overset{O_1}{\overline{\wedge}} \overline{PQRS} \overset{O_2}{\overline{\wedge}} P_2Q_2R_2S_2.$$

Proof. Let O_1 and O_2 be distinct points collinear with O but not in π. The lines OO_1O_2 and OS_1S_2 meet in O; thus O, O_1, O_2, S_1, S_2 are coplanar, so the lines O_1S_1 and O_2S_2 meet, say in the point $\overline{S} = O_1S_1 \cdot O_2S_2$. Define the points $\overline{P}, \overline{Q}, \overline{R}; \overline{A}, \overline{B}, \overline{C}$ analogously. No three of $\overline{P}, \overline{Q}, \overline{R}, \overline{S}$ are collinear: if $\overline{P}, \overline{Q}, \overline{R}$ were collinear, then the plane through $O_1\overline{PQR}$ would meet the (distinct) plane π in a line containing P_1, Q_1, R_1 and so render these points collinear. All that remains is to see that the quadrangle $\overline{PQRS}$ lies in a plane $\overline{\pi}$ (necessarily distinct from π). Suppose that each side of some opposite pair in $P_1Q_1R_1S_1$ is distinct from its homologue in $P_2Q_2R_2S_2$: say $P_1Q_1 \neq P_2Q_2$ and $R_1S_1 \neq R_2S_2$. The planes $\pi_1 = O_1P_1Q_1$ and $\pi_2 = O_2P_2Q_2$ are distinct,

so their intersection $\pi_1 \cdot \pi_2$ is a line. Now C_1 lies on P_1Q_1 and C_2 lies on P_2Q_2 so that $\overline{C} = O_1C_1 \cdot O_2C_2$ lies on $O_1P_1Q_1 \cdot O_2P_2Q_2 = \pi_1 \cdot \pi_2$; this line contains $\overline{P}$ and $\overline{Q}$ likewise. Accordingly, $\overline{P}, \overline{Q}, \overline{C}$ are collinear; similarly, $\overline{C}, \overline{R}, \overline{S}$ are collinear. Thus $\overline{PQ}$ meets $\overline{RS}$ (in $\overline{C}$) and so $\overline{PQRS}$ is indeed planar.

In the complementary case that at least one side in each opposite pair agrees with its homologue, the preparatory discussion prior to the theorem shows that we may take the quadrangles to have the form $PQRS_1$ and $PQRS_2$. In this case, if $A_1 \neq A_2$ and $B_1 \neq B_2$ then $QR = A_1A_2$ and $RP = B_1B_2$ both pass through O; this places the non-collinear points P, Q, R on the same line through O. It follows that among $(A_1, A_2), (B_1, B_2), (C_1, C_2)$ at least two pairs have entries that agree; say $A_1 = A_2 = A$ and $B_1 = B_2$. Now $A = S_1P \cdot QR = S_2P \cdot QR$ implies that $AP = S_1S_2$ whence S_1S_2 passes through P; likewise, S_1S_2 passes through Q. The resulting equality $S_1S_2 = PQ$ contradicts non-collinearity one last time and shows that this complementary case does not arise. □

Observe that the complete quadrangles $P_1Q_1R_1S_1$ and $P_2Q_2R_2S_2$ thus correspond under a perspective collineation, with centre O and axis $\overline{\pi} \cdot \pi$.

We were careful to offer a proof of Theorem 2 in full generality, making no special assumptions on the placement of the two quadrangles other than those declared in the statement of the theorem. Of course, if such simplifying assumptions are made, simplified proofs are possible. For example, if we assume that the two quadrangles have distinct homologous sides, then the proof of Theorem 2 offered above goes through without the need to consider the complementary case. If we assume instead that the two quadrangles have distinct homologous vertices then again the proof of Theorem 2 goes through without the complementary case (which involves coincident homologous vertices).

An alternative approach to Theorem 2 is of independent interest, so we offer it here. As our original approach was completely general, we shall feel free to make a simplifying assumption of general position (announced in italics below) and leave consideration of the complementary case and incident issues as an exercise for the reader. We use the theorem of Desargues and its converse, pertaining to perspective triangles: see [2] Chapter II Theorems 1 and $1'$; also [2] Chapter 2 Theorems 2.32 and 2.31.

As the triangles $P_1Q_1R_1$ and $P_2Q_2R_2$ are perspective from a point (namely, O) they are (Desargues) perspective from a line: that is, the pairwise intersections $Q_1R_1 \cdot Q_2R_2$, $R_1P_1 \cdot R_2P_2$, $P_1Q_1 \cdot P_2Q_2$ of homologous sides lie on a line, say s. Dropping instead the points R, Q, P from the quadrangles leads similarly to lines r, q, p on which lie intersections as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
(s) & Q_1R_1 \cdot Q_2R_2 & R_1P_1 \cdot R_2P_2 & P_1Q_1 \cdot P_2Q_2 \\
(r) & P_1Q_1 \cdot P_2Q_2 & Q_1S_1 \cdot Q_2S_2 & S_1P_1 \cdot S_2P_2 \\
(q) & S_1P_1 \cdot S_2P_2 & P_1R_1 \cdot P_2R_2 & R_1S_1 \cdot R_2S_2 \\
(p) & R_1S_1 \cdot R_2S_2 & S_1Q_1 \cdot S_2Q_2 & Q_1R_1 \cdot Q_2R_2.
\end{array}
$$

Simplifying assumption: six different pairwise intersection points are displayed here. That the intersections be points is of course equivalent to distinctness of homologous sides; that all six be different is then equivalent to distinctness of homologous vertices (non-collinearity again).

Now, suppose that C_1C_2 passes through O. The triangles $C_1S_1P_1$ and $C_2S_2P_2$ are perspective from O so (Desargues) the pairwise intersections $S_1P_1 \cdot S_2P_2$, $P_1C_1 \cdot P_2C_2 = P_1Q_1 \cdot P_2Q_2$, $C_1S_1 \cdot C_2S_2 = R_1S_1 \cdot R_2S_2$ lie on a line; this line shares two points with r and two points with q whence $r = q$. Similarly, perspectivity of $C_1S_1Q_1$ and $C_2S_2Q_2$ yields $r = p$. All three of the intersections on s now lie on $r = q = p$: namely, $Q_1R_1 \cdot Q_2R_2$ on p, $R_1P_1 \cdot R_2P_2$ on q, $P_1Q_1 \cdot P_2Q_2$ on r. It follows that all four lines coincide: $s = r = q = p =: o$, say.

Next, consider the triangles $A_1P_1Q_1$ and $A_2P_2Q_2$: the pairwise intersections of their homologous sides all lie on the line o, so (Desargues, converse) the lines A_1A_2, P_1P_2 and Q_1Q_2 are concurrent; perspectivity of $B_1P_1Q_1$ and $B_2P_2Q_2$ likewise passes B_1B_2, P_1P_2 and Q_1Q_2 through a point. The point of concurrence is O: the possibility $P_1P_2 = Q_1Q_2$ may be sidestepped by considering also the triangles with vertices APR and BQR, for it cannot be (non-collinearity!) that $P_1P_2 = Q_1Q_2 = R_1R_2$. It follows that A_1A_2 and B_1B_2 also pass through O.

Construction of a quadrangle $\overline{PQRS}$ of which $P_1Q_1R_1S_1$ and $P_2Q_2R_2S_2$ are shadows may now proceed somewhat differently, as follows. Choose any plane $\overline{\pi} \neq \pi$ through the line o and choose a point O_1 not on either plane. Define $\overline{S} = \overline{\pi} \cdot O_1S_1$ and define $\overline{P}, \overline{Q}, \overline{R}$ analogously. Planarity of the quadrangle $\overline{PQRS}$ is plain. As $\overline{S}$ lies on O_1S_1 and $\overline{R}$ lies on O_1R_1, the lines $\overline{SR}$ and S_1R_1 meet (on $\overline{\pi} \cdot \pi = o$) necessarily at $S_1R_1 \cdot o = S_1R_1 \cdot S_2R_2$. Concurrence of $\overline{PQ}$, P_1Q_1 and P_2Q_2 (and so on) is shown in the same way. As the points $\overline{QR} \cdot Q_2R_2$, $\overline{RP} \cdot R_2P_2$, $\overline{PQ} \cdot P_2Q_2$ all lie on o it follows (Desargues, converse) that the lines $\overline{P}P_2$, $\overline{Q}Q_2$, $\overline{R}R_2$ all pass through one point, O_2 say; $\overline{S}S_2$ clearly passes through the same point. Finally, observe that concurrence of the lines $\overline{SR}$, S_1R_1 and S_2R_2 implies (Desargues) collinearity of $O = S_1S_2 \cdot R_1R_2$, $O_1 = \overline{S}S_1 \cdot \overline{R}R_1$ and $O_2 = \overline{S}S_2 \cdot \overline{R}R_2$.

This completes an alternative approach to Theorem 2. Note the additional finding that correctness of depiction may be verified by testing just one homologous pair of diagonal points: if O is collinear with one homologous pair, then O is collinear with each. Note also the finding that the lines p, q, r, s coincide; this common line o meets the sides of $P_1Q_1R_1S_1$ and $P_2Q_2R_2S_2$ (and $\overline{PQRS}$ indeed) in the points of one and the same quadrangular set. This has a bearing on [2] page 51 exercise 2 and [1] page 22 exercise 2: there it was shown that if two (similarly placed) quadrangles determine the same quadrangular set then their diagonal triangles are perspective; here we have a converse.

We close by remarking that our criterion for correctness of depiction (namely, that the diagonal triangles also be perspective) is eminently reasonable on 'physical' grounds: if the spatial quadrangle represented by $P_1Q_1R_1S_1$ is planar, then its diagonals S_1Q_1 and R_1P_1 meet in a material point B_1 having B_2 as shadow; if it is not planar, then the 'intersection' B_1 is not material and the shadow 'intersection' B_2 is a trick of the light.

References

[1] H.S.M. Coxeter, *Projective Geometry*, Second Edition, Springer-Verlag (1987).
[2] O. Veblen and J.W. Young, *Projective Geometry*, Volume I, Ginn and Company (1910).

P. L. Robinson
Department of Mathematics
University of Florida
Gainesville
FL 32611